

# INFORMATION BULLETIN

## JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT

Number: B98-48

Date: December 10, 1998

Expiration Date: 6/30/99

69:32:is

TO: SERVICE DELIVERY AREA ADMINISTRATORS  
PRIVATE INDUSTRY COUNCIL CHAIRPERSONS  
JTPD PROGRAM OPERATORS  
EDD JOB SERVICE OFFICE MANAGERS  
JTPD STAFF

SUBJECT: PY 1998-99 PERFORMANCE MODEL FOR SDAS THAT  
IMPLEMENT WAIVERS

The Department of Labor (DOL) approved California's State Waiver Plan on May 8, 1998. As a condition of approval, DOL required the state to establish a goal to increase performance on each core measure and the Title III Entered Employment Rate by five percent in Program Year (PY) 1998-99. Additionally, DOL required the state to measure the increase using performance outcomes in PY 1997-98 as the baseline year and to include waiver performance expectations in the PY 1998-99 incentive award process.

To determine the increase that would be required of each Service Delivery Area (SDA) to achieve a statewide increase of five percent on each performance measure in PY 1998-99, the state developed a proposed model that was issued to SDAs for review and comments in Information Bulletin B97-86 on January 30, 1998. Due to the time frame, this model included PY 1995-96 performance levels as the baseline year for calculating the expected increase on each measure.

This information bulletin includes an updated performance model that is based on actual performance achieved by SDAs on each measure in PY 1997-98. This model will be used to determine the performance increase required of SDAs that choose to implement one or more of the optional waivers. Only SDAs that select optional waivers will use the model to determine their required performance increase on each measure in PY 1998-99. **The SDAs that do not implement the optional waivers will be required to increase their PY 1997-98 performance on the Youth Positive Termination Rate by a flat two percent in PY 1998-99.** The SDAs that implement one or more optional waivers must use the attached tables to determine the amount of increase required on each performance measure in PY 1998-99. The SDAs that achieve the required increase on each measure will receive an additional \$5,000 incentive award for PY 1998-99.

Attachment 1 includes the guiding principles that were used to develop the model, along with line item instructions for its use. Attachments 2 through 7 contain a separate table for each performance measure for use in determining the required increase under waivers. Please refer to Directive D98-10, California Policy for Statewide and Optional Waivers, for additional information on waiver requirements.

Questions concerning the attached performance models should be directed to Karen Yuke with the Data Analysis Unit at (916) 654-7585.

/S/ BILL BURKE  
Assistant Deputy Director

Attachments

## **MODEL FOR MEASUREMENT OF PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT UNDER WAIVERS**

The model was developed around the following principles of performance improvement:

- California and the local areas are committed to continuous improvement;
- Lower performing local areas will be expected to increase their performance relatively more than higher performing local areas; and
- Expectations for performance improvement should consider the relative potential for success (e.g., a local area with poor economic conditions and a large client base with multiple barriers should not be expected to perform as well as an area without these challenges).

The column references below refer to the attached tables. A separate table must be used to determine the amount of increase that is required for each performance measure.

Column A	This represents the actual SDA performance for PY 97-98.
Column A-1	This represents ranges for actual performance in PY 1997-98. These ranges provide a framework to address the principle that higher performing SDAs should not be expected to increase performance to as great a degree as relatively lower performers. A local area is assigned to a range based on its actual performance in PY 1997-98.
Column B	This is the performance improvement expectation under waivers for each range.
Column C	This is the calculation of the expected improvement amount (Column A multiplied by Column B).
Column D	This is the unadjusted actual performance expectation after implementation of waivers. This is actual performance in the base year plus the performance increase defined in Column C.
Column E	This is the adjustment to the actual performance expectation based on the "risk factors in the local area." The number used is the local area adjustment to the national departure point as defined by the Secretary of Labor's performance model. This number should be taken directly from the performance standard worksheets for each measure.
Column F	This represents a local area's expected actual performance after implementation of waivers.

## MODEL FOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

### Title II Adult Follow-Up Employment Rate

(A) SDA Actual Performance for PY 1997-98 <sup>(1)</sup>	(A-1) Ranges for Actual PY 1997-98 Performance	(B) Expected Percentage Improvement	(C) Actual Performance Increase (AxB)	(D) PY 1998-99 Unadjusted Performance Goal (A+C)	(E) PY 1997-98 Performance Model Adjustment <sup>(4)</sup>	(F) Adjusted PY 1998-99 Performance Goal (D+E)
	= > 85.0 <sup>(2)</sup>	0.0%				
	75.0-84.99	1.0%				
	72.0-74.99	2.0%				
	68.0-71.99	3.0%				
	66.0-67.99	4.0%				
	61.0-65.99	5.0%				
	58.0-60.99	6.0%				
	= < 57.99 <sup>(3)</sup>	7.0%				

(1) Use the Service Delivery Area (SDA) actual performance for Program Year (PY) 1997-98.

(2) Expected performance is capped at 85.0%.

(3) The state will negotiate an expected performance increase with SDAs when performance is 57.99% or below on a case-by-case basis.

(4) Actual adjustment to the national departure point. The calculation of this factor occurs at the end of the PY. It represents the effect of local factors (participant characteristics and economic conditions) on SDA performance expectations compared to national averages.

FB98-48A

## MODEL FOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

### Title II Adult Follow-Up Weekly Earnings

(A) SDA Actual Performance for PY 1997-98 <sup>(1)</sup>	(A-1) Ranges for Actual PY 1997-98 Performance	(B) Expected Percentage Improvement	(C) Actual Performance Increase (AxB)	(D) PY 1998-99 Unadjusted Performance Goal (A+C)	(E) PY 1997-98 Performance Model Adjustment <sup>(4)</sup>	(F) Adjusted PY 1998-99 Performance Goal (D+E)
	= > 470.00 <sup>(2)</sup>	0.0%				
	408.00-469.99	1.0%				
	381.00-407.99	2.0%				
	369.00-380.99	3.0%				
	352.00-368.99	4.0%				
	323.00-351.99	5.0%				
	284.00-322.99	6.0%				
	= < 283.99 <sup>(3)</sup>	7.0%				

(1) Use the SDA actual performance for PY 1997-98.

(2) Expected performance is capped at \$470.00.

(3) The state will negotiate an expected performance increase with SDAs when performance is \$283.99 or below on a case-by-case basis.

(4) Actual adjustment to the national departure point. The calculation of this factor occurs at the end of the PY. It represents the effect of local factors (participant characteristics and economic conditions) on SDA performance expectations compared to national averages.

FB98-48B

## MODEL FOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

### Title II Welfare Follow-Up Employment Rate

(A) SDA Actual Performance for PY 1997-98 <sup>(1)</sup>	(A-1) Ranges for Actual PY 1997-98 Performance	(B) Expected Percentage Improvement	(C) Actual Performance Increase (AxB)	(D) PY 1998-99 Unadjusted Performance Goal (A+C)	(E) PY 1997-98 Performance Model Adjustment <sup>(4)</sup>	(F) Adjusted PY 1998-99 Performance Goal (D+E)
	= > 78.0 <sup>(2)</sup>	0.0%				
	70.0-77.99	1.0%				
	67.0-69.99	2.0%				
	66.0-66.99	3.0%				
	61.0-65.99	4.0%				
	52.0-60.99	5.0%				
	47.0-51.99	6.0%				
	= < 46.99 <sup>(3)</sup>	7.0%				

(1) Use the SDA actual performance for PY 1997-98.

(2) Expected performance is capped at 78.0%.

(3) The state will negotiate an expected performance increase with SDAs when performance is 46.99% or below on a case-by-case basis.

(4) Actual adjustment to the national departure point. The calculation of this factor occurs at the end of the PY. It represents the effect of local factors (participant characteristics and economic conditions) on SDA performance expectations compared to national averages.

FB98-48C

## MODEL FOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

### Title II Welfare Follow-Up Weekly Earnings

(A) SDA Actual Performance for PY 1997-98 <sup>(1)</sup>	(A-1) Ranges for Actual PY 1997-98 Performance	(B) Expected Percentage Improvement	(C) Actual Performance Increase (AxB)	(D) PY 1998-99 Unadjusted Performance Goal (A+C)	(E) PY 1997-98 Performance Model Adjustment <sup>(4)</sup>	(F) Adjusted PY 1998-99 Performance Goal (D+E)
	= > 415.00 <sup>(2)</sup>	0.0%				
	388.00-414.99	1.0%				
	368.00-387.99	2.0%				
	351.00-367.99	3.0%				
	323.00-350.99	4.0%				
	298.00-322.99	5.0%				
	264.00-297.99	6.0%				
	= < 263.99 <sup>(3)</sup>	7.0%				

- (1) Use the SDA actual performance PY 1997-98.
- (2) Expected performance is capped at \$415.00.
- (3) The state will negotiate an expected performance increase with SDAs when performance is \$263.99 or below on a case-by-case basis.
- (4) Actual adjustment to the national departure point. The calculation of this factor occurs at the end of the PY. It represents the effect of local factors (participant characteristics and economic conditions) on SDA performance expectations compared to national averages.

FB98-48D

## MODEL FOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

### Title II Youth Positive Termination Rate

(A) SDA Actual Performance for PY 1997-98 <sup>(1)</sup>	(A-1) Ranges for Actual PY 1997-98 Performance	(B) Expected Percentage Improvement	(C) Actual Performance Increase (AxB)	(D) PY 1998-99 Unadjusted Performance Goal (A+C)	(E) PY 1997-98 Performance Model Adjustment <sup>(4)</sup>	(F) Adjusted PY 1998-99 Performance Goal (D+E)
	= > 97.0 <sup>(2)</sup>	0.0%				
	92.0-96.99	1.0%				
	90.0-91.99	2.0%				
	87.0-89.99	3.0%				
	83.0-86.99	4.0%				
	74.0-82.99	5.0%				
	59.0-73.99	6.0%				
	= < 58.99 <sup>(3)</sup>	7.0%				

(1) Use the SDA actual performance for PY 1997-98.

(2) Expected performance is capped at 97.0%.

(3) The state will negotiate an expected performance increase with SDAs when performance is 58.99% or below on a case-by-case basis.

(4) Actual adjustment to the national departure point. The calculation of this factor occurs at the end of the PY. It represents the effect of local factors (participant characteristics and economic conditions) on SDA performance expectations compared to national averages.

FB98-48E



## MODEL FOR PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

### Title III Entered Employment Rate

(A) Actual Performance for PY 1997-98 <sup>(1)</sup>	(A-1) Ranges for Actual PY 1997-98 Performance	(B) Expected Percentage Improvement	(C) Actual Performance Increase (AxB)	(D) PY 1998-99 Unadjusted Performance Goal (A+C)	(E) PY 1997-98 Performance Model Adjustment <sup>(4)</sup>	(F) Adjusted PY 1998-99 Performance Goal (D+E)
	= > 89.0 <sup>(2)</sup>	0.0%				
	85.0-88.99	1.0%				
	81.0-84.99	2.0%				
	80.0-80.99	3.0%				
	78.0-79.99	4.0%				
	75.0-77.99	5.0%				
	70.0-74.99	6.0%				
	= < 69.99 <sup>(3)</sup>	7.0%				

- (1) Use the SDA actual performance for PY 1997-98.
- (2) Expected performance is capped at 89.0%.
- (3) The state will negotiate an expected performance increase with SDAs when performance is 69.99% or below on a case-by-case basis.
- (4) Actual adjustment to the national departure point. The calculation of this factor occurs at the end of the PY. It represents the effect of local factors (participant characteristics and economic conditions) on SDA performance expectations compared to national averages.

FB98-48F